



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,715	05/04/2001	Steven M. Rothman	1908-95650	9398

321 7590 01/07/2003

SENNIGER POWERS LEAVITT AND ROEDEL
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
16TH FLOOR
ST LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER

GIBSON, ROY DEAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3739

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/905,715

Applicant(s)

ROTHMAN, STEVEN M. *OR*

Examiner

Roy D. Gibson

Art Unit

3739

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on IDS filed 06 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 4-9 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because they depend from multiple dependent claim 3. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 4-9 have not been further treated on the merits except as being dependent on claim 1.

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: the reference in the ending parentheses should be deleted. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hill et al. (Epilepsia, 41(10): 1241-1248, 2000.) Note that although the applicant is one of the authors of the published article, the inventive entity for the application is Steven Rothman alone.

As to claims 1 and 10-11, Hill et al. disclose a method for treating a patient having epilepsy comprising:

locating a focal site that is the source of an intractable focal seizure, the focal site being located on a brain's neocortical surface;

Art Unit: 3739

establishing direct physical contact between the focal site and a cooling means:
and

activating the cooling means and cooling the focal site to abort the intractable focal seizure (p. 1247, col. 2-p. 1248, col. 1).

As to claim 2, Hill et al. disclose that the focal site is determined by a cortical mapping process (p.1248, col. 1).

As to claims 4-7 and 12 Hill et al. disclose manual activation of a Peltier chip to a temperature between 24-30°C (p.1248, Figure 8).

As to claim 9, Hill et al. disclose that the activation step is determined by a seizure detection (p.1248, col. 1).

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lesser et al. (6,248,126).

As to claims 1 and 10-11, Lesser et al. disclose a method for treating a patient having epilepsy comprising:

locating a focal site that is the source of an intractable focal seizure, the focal site being located on a brain's neocortical surface;

establishing direct physical contact between the focal site and a cooling means:
and

Art Unit: 3739

activating the cooling means and cooling the focal site to abort the intractable focal seizure (col. 1, line 15-col. 2, line 22, col. 3, lines 1-32, col. 4, line 56-col. 5, line 3, col. 5, lines 27-55, col. 7, line 28-col. 8, line 44 and col. 9, lines 14-30). Note that claim 10, is identical to claim 1, except for "rapidly" in line 7, which is a broad and undefined limitation that does not patently distinguish claim 10 over claim 1.

As to claims 2-3, Lesser et al. disclose that the focal site is determined by a cortical mapping process accomplished by establishing physical contact between a focal site and a cooling means and activating the cooling means to cool the focal site and eliminate the site as a seizure origin site (col. 7, lines 28-50 and col. 8, lines 33-44).

As to claims 4-7 and 12, Lesser et al. disclose manual activation of a Peltier chip to a temperature between 24-30 °C, which is a decrease of 7-13 °C (col. 9, lines 26-30).

As to claim 8, Lesser et al. disclose activating at a frequency and duration so that the seizure is reduced (inherent in the process since the objective is the same as claimed by the applicant).

As to claim 9, Lesser et al. disclose that the activation step is determined by a seizure detection (col. 8, lines 33-44).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Fischell et al. (6,473,639) disclose information processing techniques used in the treatment of epilepsy; Rise (6,337,997) discloses an implantable seizure warning system; Lasemidis et al. (6,304,775) disclose a seizure warning and


prediction system; Hively et al. (5,857,978) disclose epileptic seizure prediction by non-linear methods; and Olsen et al. (5,311,876) disclose automation detection of seizures using EEG signals.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roy D. Gibson whose telephone number is 703-308-3520. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30 am-4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on 703-308-0994. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9302 for regular communications and 703-872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0873.

January 2, 2003


Roy Gibson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3739